



INTERSTATE 19 – FRONTAGE ROADS STUDY

Contract T0449P0001
Purchase Order PG KG2999
Task Assignment TPD01-08

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 3

May 14, 2008
ADOT Tucson District Offices
ADOT Tucson District
1221 South 2nd Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85713-1602

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Danny Granillo, *ADOT Tucson District*
Bill Adamson, *Co-Chair, Santa Cruz
Valley Bicycle Advocate Committee*
Jeff Tanner, *U.S. Border Patrol*
Jonathan Crowe, *Pima County DOT*
Daniel Williams, *ADOT Tucson District*
Michael Bends, *San Xavier District*
Mark Pugh, *San Xavier District*
Stephen Wilson, *ADOT Tucson District*

Teresa Welborn, *ADOT CCP*
Eduardo Delgado, *City of Nogales*
Reza Karimvand, *ADOT Tucson
District*
Jeremy Papuga, *PAG*
Charlene FitzGerald, *ADOT TPD
(Project Manager)*

Consultant Staff in Attendance

Dave Perkins, *Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.*
Brent Crowther, *Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.*

MEETING SUMMARY

A Technical Advisory Committee Meeting for the Interstate 19 Frontage Road Study was held on May 14, 2008 at the ADOT Tucson District. The meeting began at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Charlene FitzGerald, ADOT TPD Project Manager, opened the meeting and thanked all for their attendance. Agenda items included an a review of project schedule, overview of Working Papers 3, and discussion of upcoming public involvement activities.

The following are key points for each agenda item that were discussed during the meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

1. Brent Crowther reviewed key purposes of the study, including:
 - a. Document status of long-range frontage road recommendations
 - b. Identify 10-year traffic and safety deficiencies on frontage roads
 - c. Document jurisdictional perspectives on frontage roads
 - d. Recommend a 10-year program of multi-modal improvements

Review of Progress and Schedule

2. Brent Crowther provided an overview of the progress to date and schedule. Working Paper 1 and 2 have been completed. Draft Working Paper 3 has been distributed to the TAC and review comments are due by May 16, 2008. Round 2 public meetings are scheduled for late May, 2008.

Working Paper Overview

3. The RTA program includes improvements to transit service in Pima County and Sahuarita and a park-n-ride lot in Green Valley. These projects need to be recognized as funded projects in the vicinity of I-19.
4. Including golf cart prohibitions under the alternate modes heading is awkward. Consider placing golf cart prohibitions under a safety heading.
5. What is the red letter process and is it currently used? The process is currently used as a way for counties and local jurisdictions to notify ADOT of development that may impact the state highway system. It was noted that use of the process by counties and local jurisdictions is uneven. It was also noted that Pima County uses the red letter process however the timeliness of ADOT reviews creates often creates problems for Pima County Development Services. Representatives from ADOT and Pima County Development Services will meet to discuss these issues.
6. In reference to county and local involvement in frontage road operations and maintenance through Inter-Governmental Agreements, it was acknowledged that operations and maintenance are important to maintaining a safe and efficient frontage roads but resource and funding limitations for county and local jurisdictions may impact their ability to provide operations and maintenance services.
7. The Adopt-A-Highway program for the frontage roads was suggested as a means of maintaining frontage roads.
8. It is important to communicate to the public that the recommended projects do not reflect improvements to the frontage roads that will be implemented as part of mitigating impacts from future development along the frontage roads.
9. It was clarified that the current ADOT policy was to construct 4-foot paved shoulders as part of frontage road widening projects. It was stated that the bicycle community has requested construction of wider, 6-foot wide shoulders.

10. When describing project priorities, consider dropping reference to years since funding limitations may not allow for the construction of these projects within these time frames. KHA will develop an alternative approach for communicating priorities and submit to Charlene FitzGerald for consideration.

Proposed Program of Projects

11. Project 1 – This recommendation will be considered in the ADOT Frontage Road, Rio Rico to County Club DCR/EA project.
12. Project 2 – This construction cost estimate does not include right-of-way costs. Right-of-way costs are not included in any of the construction cost estimates however the cost of design has been included.
13. Project 3 – The frontage road alignment concept under development by Baker Engineering should be reflected in this project description. Frank Gesterling is the Baker project manager.
14. Project 4 – It was clarified that should widening was not included in this project.
15. Project 5 and 6 – Consider combining these projects.
16. Project 7 – No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
17. Project 8 – No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
18. Project 9 – No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
19. Project 10 – No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
20. Project 11 – Does this project (or any of the other safety projects) correlate to ADOT's HES project listing? Reza Karimvand requested crash data for the safety projects for use in applying for HES funds. It was asked why this project did not include frontage road widening and shoulder construction. It was explained that this project is a safety project to improve intersection safety. Typically, widening and construction of shoulders is a capacity project which is not justified at this location. It was suggested that the project description page clearly identify each project as a safety project, a capacity project, or a pavement preservation project.
21. It is important to communicate to the public that local participation and public-private partnerships can accelerate the implementation of projects on the state highway system.
22. It was suggested that funded projects be listed and presented at the upcoming open houses. The list contained in Working Paper No. 3 will be reviewed by Steve Wilson and changes to the listing will be communicated to Brent Crowther by May 21, 2008.
23. It was suggested that widening of the east frontage road from Canoa to Arivaca should be a priority project.
24. Project 12 – No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
25. Project 13 – No comments from the TAC were received on this project.

26. Project 14—No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
27. Project 15—No comments from the TAC were received on this project.
28. It was stated that the shuttle signal lights near I-19 interchanges will be taken out in the future.
29. DMJM should be coordinated with on possible frontage roads (or parallel collectors) between San Xavier and Los Reales.
30. It was stated that restriping of frontages roads is possible as a part of pavement preservation. The minimum lane width is 12 feet.
31. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.

Public Involvement

32. Brent Crowther discussed the upcoming schedule of open houses. Three open houses are planned in May 2008:
 - a. May 27 – Tubac
 - b. May 28 – Green Valley
 - c. May 29 – Nogales

The focus of the open houses will be to obtain public input on frontage road recommended projects.

18. The next step of the project will be to document public involvement Round 2, and to produce final documentation / final report.